

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Chief Minister satisfied with his answer?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—It is for me to judge. I cannot take notice of these trivial allegations and allow the time of the House to be wasted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not for you to judge whether the time of the House is wasted or not. It is for the House and the Speaker.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—It is equally for the House. It is not as though I am speaking in my individual capacity.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Chief Minister is prepared to answer, he may do so, or he may refuse. The question is: there is an adjournment motion wherein it is set out that such a petition was presented and an allegation made that the petition was torn. Whether such a petition was presented and whether that petition was torn or not, if he is pleased, he may answer; otherwise not. So far, there is no satisfactory reply as to whether the petition was presented or not and whether such a thing has taken place or not.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA (Sagar—Hosangar).—The Chair may ask the mover to say something, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will do it. I know my duty.

(The Chief Minister did not make any further statement.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—So, shall I take it there is no further answer?

Has Sri Nagappa anything to say in the matter?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ (ತರೀಕೆರೆ).—ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ನಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಆ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವಾಗ ಈ ಒಂದು ಶೋಚನೀಯನಾದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಸನದಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಕೂಡ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ಪ್ರಜಾಪಾಣಿ ಪೇಪರ್‌ನಲ್ಲೂ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗಿದೆ, ಚೀಫ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಒದಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You need not go to the merits of the case.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ವ್ಯಸನದಿಂದ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲೂ ಸಹ ನಿಮ್ಮ ತರಗತಿಯವರಿಗೆ.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is again speaking on merits of the case. The Chief Minister says, he has not received any such allegations.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ಈಚೆಗೆ ಮನೆಗಳು ಸುಟ್ಟು...

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is enough. I understand you.

The incident is reported to have taken place on the 5th April 1954 whereas the notice of the motion has been given today. As the member has not taken earliest opportunity of tabling the motion, I am inclined to disallow it on that ground.

Apart from this, I would like to mention that after the setting up of a Ministry which is fully responsible to the Legislature and when opportunities are provided in abundance for raising matters of importance on the floor of the House, an adjournment motion has lost its earlier significance. The rarity of adjournment motions in the House of Commons now may be gauged from the fact that the average number of adjournment motions discussed therein is calculated at 1.5 per annum. It is therefore, I may say, necessary that Hon'ble Members should no longer continue to look upon an adjournment motion as a normal device for raising discussion on any important matter as in the past. As Speaker Peel in the House of Commons observed as early as 1894 in a ruling which has become a classic, "what I think was contemplated was the occurrence of some sudden emergency in Home or in Foreign Affairs," the urgency must be of such a character that the matter can brook no delay and should be discussed immediately.

I may add that a short notice question by Sri S. Gopala Gowda on the same subject has been received and I have no doubt that where the question is of importance, the Minister concerned will not refuse his consent to answer the question and if the member is not satisfied with the reply there is an opportunity for raising discussion under rule 39. For these reasons I hold that the motion is not in order.

2. Throwing out of employment temporary Teachers in Mysore District Board High Schools.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is another adjournment motion given notice of by

(MR. SPEAKER.)

Sri P. R. Ramaiya which is as follows:

“That this House do now adjourn to discuss a matter of public importance and of recent occurrence, *viz.*, throwing out of employment many temporary teachers working in Mysore District Board High Schools.”

Has the Hon'ble Minister for Education anything to say in the matter?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—The allegation is so vague and there is no emergency either at all. Therefore the motion is not in order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Has the Hon'ble Member Sri P. R. Ramaiya anything to say?

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA (Basavangudi).—Sir, under a Government order issued on 6th April, many temporary teachers of the Mysore District Board High Schools have been given notice of terminating their appointments; and they have represented to me that they have served in these schools for a number of years and their appointments are at stake, owing to the pressing nature of the operation of the C.R.B. Rules. They say it is not possible for them under the prevailing circumstances to try for a change in profession. Therefore, they request the Government to consider their case in a sympathetic manner.

1 P.M.

Sir, this is a matter of urgent public importance and I have brought it to the notice of the Government. They may do the needful.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I need not read the adjournment motion. According to rules 40 and 42 of the Rules of Procedure, the matter to be raised must be, among other things, definite. The above motion for adjournment of the House, I am afraid, is not definite as the member has not stated when the teachers were thrown out of employment. Besides, the member himself has stated that the teachers were holding appointments of a temporary nature and as such likely to be terminated. I therefore hold that this is not in order.

Morning Session on Tamil New Year's Day.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—One request to the House. Tomorrow happens to be the Tamil New Year day and many of my friends feel that the session may be held in the morning, so that they may observe the usual spiritual rites in the afternoon.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Leader of the House).—The Hon'ble Member has made a suggestion that the House may sit in the morning; I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.—At 8-30?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Yes.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION.

(Statement by the Chief Minister).

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—Sir, I believe my Hon'ble friend the Law Minister said that a statement would be made in regard to the request made on the floor the House regarding the amendment to the Constitution. There is a definite procedure prescribed by the Constitution under Article 368 as to how constitutional amendments have to be effected. According to that article, Sir, in certain respects the State Legislatures have been conferred the right to ratify. I do not find the power of initiation being given to the State Legislature so far as the constitutional amendments are concerned. This Legislature as well as the Government work according to the articles of this Constitution. Therefore, strictly construed, it is a matter for consideration whether this House can sponsor constitutional amendments. If it is to be looked at from the point of view of the rights and privileges and responsibilities conferred on this House, this House has no power to initiate constitutional amendments. If you take, what is called, the general view of the matter and not the legal and constitutional view of the matter, it is open to this House to discuss any matter. When there is a specific